

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-29 are now pending in the application. Support for the foregoing amendments can be found throughout the specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

Claims 1 and 20 are objected to because of certain informalities. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 20 to address the Examiner's objection. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-7, 10, and 12-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Miyatake (U.S. Pat. No. 5,842,167). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 requires "said text-to-speech engine ... converting said text-input into a processed representation ... including ... a word-boundary ..., wherein said at least one speech feature of said word-boundary includes boundary strength and pause duration." The Examiner asserts that "the distance between the dashed lines between synthesis units" in figure 4 of Miyatake is analogous to a word-boundary representation associated with boundary strength. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant submits that Miyatake at best shows that the above mentioned distance represents pause durations of the inserted pauses to the prosodic data, rather than boundary strength.

Miyatake does not appear concerned about boundary strength. Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly appreciate the difference between a pause duration and boundary strength. Boundary strength for example may define whether words are coupled tightly or loosely. Variations in boundary strength may also change liaison. Allophones can be eliminated and two words can become one. In fact, Miyatake appears completely silent about boundary strength and does not disclose a representation having word-boundary associated with boundary strength. Thus, Miyatake cannot disclose a text-to-speech engine that converts text-input to that representation.

Claim 1 further requires “a visual editing interface ... displays and allows editing of said at least one speech feature [, including boundary strength and pause duration,] of said word-boundary[.]” Applicant submits that Miyatake does not appear to disclose speech features including boundary strength. As presented above, Miyatake at the best shows a pause duration. Thus, Miyatake cannot teach an interface that allows editing features including boundary strength.

Claim 1 further requires “editing (a) a displayed boundary and (b) spacing between a displayed segment and said displayed boundary.” The Examiner asserts that Miyatake states “the speech synthesizing means 6 inserts pauses at the beginning and the end of ‘hai’,” thus anticipating the above claimed features. Applicant is unclear whether the dashed line or the distance between the dashed lines in figure 4 is considered by the Examiner as analogous to the claimed displayed boundary. In any event, assuming the Examiner’s interpretation as to the claimed display boundary is correct, still only one of the dashed line and the distance can be considered as

analogous to the claimed boundary. Thus, the techniques shown in Miyatake (i.e., inserting pauses) at best can be considered as analogous to either editing the displayed boundary or editing the spacing, but cannot be both (again, assuming the Examiner's interpretation as to the claimed display boundary is correct). Therefore, Applicant submits that Miyatake fails to disclose the above claimed features.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 8, 9, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyatake (U.S. Pat. No. 5,842,167) in view of Kobal et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,099,828). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 8, 9, and 11 depend from claim 1. Applicant submits that the reasons presented above regarding claim 1 apply here equally. Applicant further submits that Kobal fails to cure the deficiencies of Miyatake, because Kobal appears silent about the above mentioned distinguishing features of claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 8, 9, and 11 define over the art cited by the Examiner.

#### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 15, 2009

By: Timothy D. MacIntyre/  
Gregory A. Stobbs  
Reg. No.: 28,764  
Timothy D. MacIntyre  
Reg. No.: 42,824

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

GAS/TDM/PFD/evm

14446229.1